

bringing new life and health to diseased tissues. * * * if you have aggravated sores, ulcers, pimples, eczema or piles that have resisted treatment for months or years, * * * Science hails radium and radium rays as one of the greatest discoveries of the age in years for skin troubles. Adium, because of its radium-active properties acts in a similar manner and because of its ease of application can be used in the home as safely and as easily as an ordinary salve or ointment. Adium also contains other valuable and proven ingredients for the skin which alone would stamp it as a most effective treatment for many forms of skin trouble. * * * The radium-active properties of Adium act continuously to penetrate * * * Skin Eruptions—Eruptions due to external cause usually respond quickly to Adium. * * * Pimples * * * Spread Adium well over the pimples * * * Repeat nightly until pimples * * * have entirely disappeared. Continue for a short time after the pimples have gone * * * Eczema— * * * Adium gives speedy and effective relief in most forms of this painful, itching, disfiguring disease. * * * Repeat treatment every night * * * until disease is relieved. Boils—First Adium relieves the pain and soreness. Used early enough it will often absorb the boil. Then it helps the boil to break quickly and end; after which it helps restore the skin to normal condition. Cover boil with Adium * * * Repeat daily * * * until boil or boils have disappeared. * * * These curative rays * * * Only their wonderful healing and reparative benefits are perceived, * * * Easy Way To Treat Piles * * * Piles—The penetrating, * * * healing properties of Adium are invaluable to the sufferer from Piles and Hemorrhoids. * * * Adium pours its active radium rays deep into the affected parts, stimulates blood circulation, relieves sluggishness and congestion. * * * for treating piles. Sore * * * Aching * * * Feet— * * * Old Sores and Surface Ulcers—Many of the most stubborn, aggravating, long-standing sores and superficial ulcers have yielded to the penetrating, healing rays of Adium. Apply * * * over sores, * * * Repeat treatment until sores are healed. * * * Psoriasis or Scaly Red Patches and other Skin Diseases— * * * Itch, Tetter, Ringworm, * * * Ugly Skin on Legs— * * * pours its healing rays deep into the affected tissues to relieve sluggishness and congestion, stimulate the reparative processes and build up diseased tissues.”

On March 5, 1932, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20733. Adulteration and misbranding of Gliciodina. U. S. v. Jose G. Carde (Gliciodina Manufacturing Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$5 and costs. (F. & D. no. 28128. I. S. nos. 5784, 38436.)

This case was based on the sale in Puerto Rico of 2 lots of a drug preparation known as Gliciodina which examination disclosed contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed on the bottle and carton labels and in a circular shipped with the article. Tests of the article also showed that it was not an antiseptic and disinfectant, as claimed in the labeling. One of the lots contained less alcohol than declared.

On January 27, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of Puerto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States an information against Jose G. Carde, trading as the Gliciodina Manufacturing Co., Manati, P. R., alleging that the defendant had offered for sale and had sold in Puerto Rico, between the dates of May 13, 1930 and November 10, 1931, two lots of the said Gliciodina, which was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of small proportions of iodine, potassium iodide, thymol and menthol, alcohol, and water. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was neither an antiseptic nor a disinfectant when used as directed.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that it was represented to be an antiseptic and disinfectant when used as directed, and was also represented to contain 40 percent of

alcohol; whereas it was not antiseptic and disinfectant when used as directed, and a portion of the article contained not more than 31.5 percent of alcohol.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Antiseptic and Disinfectant * * * Acts on the germs that continuously multiply themselves in the mouth, diminishing in this way their destructive action on the dental tissues. Method of Using: 15 or 20 drops in a glassful of water", with respect to both lots of the article, and the statement "40% Alcohol", with respect to one of the lots, were false and misleading since the article was not an antiseptic and disinfectant when used as directed, and the said lot contained less than 40 percent of alcohol. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the lot that contained less alcohol than declared on the label for the further reason that the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the article, since the statement made was incorrect. The information also charged that one of the lots was further misbranded in that certain statements, designs, and devices, appearing on the bottle and carton labels and in the circular shipped with the article, regarding its curative and therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a treatment, remedy and cure for all diseases of the mouth and respiratory tract; as a preventive for inflammations and "Pyorrhea Alveolar" and effective as a counter-irritant for inflammations of the gums and pericementitis; effective to destroy the formation of sanguineous and salivary calculi; effective to prevent the formation of caries; and effective as a treatment for sick gums; and that the remaining lot was further misbranded in that it was falsely and fraudulently represented to be effective as a treatment, remedy and cure for all diseases of the mouth and all affections of the mouth; effective as a preventive against "Pyorrhea Alveolar"; effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for affections of the respiratory tract; effective as a counter-irritant against pericementitis; effective as a treatment for inflammation of the gums; effective to destroy the formation of sanguineous and salivary calculi and to prevent the formation of caries; and effective as a treatment for sick gums.

On January 27, 1933, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$5 and costs.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20734. Adulteration and misbranding of Healthagain. U. S. v. 8 Bottles of Healthagain. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.
(F. & D. no. 29577. Sample nos. 21776-A, 21777-A, 21778-A.)

The product Healthagain, involved in this case, was labeled to convey the impression that it was of vegetable origin and was a food medicine, also that it contained no harmful drugs. It contained, however, Epsom salt, a mineral drug; it was not in any sense a food; and certain of the ingredients might be harmful. The labeling of the article bore unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On December 2, 1932, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States a libel praying seizure and condemnation of eight bottles of the said Healthagain, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 18, 1932, by John Edward, president of the Healthagain Laboratories, Inc., from Wellsburg, W. Va., to Pittsburgh, Pa., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Healthagain * * * Healthagain Laboratories, Inc. * * * A Food Medicine Compounded of U. S. P. Vegetable Extracts & Alfalfa * * * No Harmful Drugs."

Analyses of samples of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of Epsom salt (approximately 20 percent), extracts of plant drugs, including laxative drugs such as jalap, senna, and rhubarb, alcohol (approximately 3.2 percent), sugar (approximately 20 percent), and water.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, namely, "Compounded of U. S. P. Vegetable Extracts and Alfalfa", since it contained a considerable proportion of Epsom salt, a mineral drug.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the label, "Compounded of U. S. P. Vegetable Extracts and Alfalfa", "A Food Medi-